

## REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the non-final Office Action mailed on May 1, 2008. It is believed that no fee is due in connection with this Response, however, the Director is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-1818. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. 112857-61 on the account statement.

Claims 44-63 are pending in this application. Claims 1-43 were previously cancelled. In the Office Action, Claims 44-48, 50-56, 58-59, and 60-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 and Claims 49 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. In response, Claims 44 and 52 have been amended. The amendment does not add new matter. In view of the amendment and/or for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 44 and 52 have been amended for clarification purposes to recite, in part, “reproducing the state of the application program as of the day and time of the located desktop environment by selecting the application data in the located desktop environment.” The amendment as discussed above is fully supported in the specification. For example, in paragraph [0118] of the specification, Applicants disclose reproducing the state of a file at the time corresponding to the received time when a file icon on the located desktop is opened.

In the Office Action, Claims 44-48, 50-56, 58-59, and 60-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0075319 to Hochmuth (“*Hochmuth*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

With respect to Claims 44 and 52, *Hochmuth* does not teach or suggest reproducing the state of the application program at about the set received time information. The disclosure in *Hochmuth* is directed to the creation of new shortcut icons, and appears to be unrelated to the reproduction of application programs at a set time. In *Hochmuth*, a reference to each file accessed via the graphical user interface is stored in a desktop event log along with a time stamp indicating when the event occurred. See, *Hochmuth*, paragraph [0023]. The desktop event log is then examined to determine if a particular file has been accessed more than a threshold number of times within a specified period required to create a shortcut. See, *Hochmuth*, paragraph

[0024]. However, the state of the file as of the time accessed is not stored in the desktop event log. Thus, the state of the file as of the time accessed cannot be reproduced at a later date.

As embodied by the claims and further supported in the specification, the claimed invention provides reproducing the state of the file or application program at the time corresponding to the set time. See, specification, paragraph [0118]. In a first technique, for example, each time a change is made to a file, the version information of the file is stored together with the time. See, specification, paragraph [0119]. In a second technique, for example, each time a change is made to a file, the difference between the previous file and the changed file is stored. See, specification, paragraph [0120]. The state of the application program as of the day and time of the located desktop environment as claimed can then be reproduced by selecting an application icon on the located desktop which, for example, opens the corresponding version of the application program or applies the differences between the previous files in sequence to create the desired file contents.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the anticipation rejection with respect to Claims 44-48, 50-56, 58-59, and 60-63 be reconsidered and the rejection be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 49 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hochmuth* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,924 to Wu et al. ("*Wu*"). However, *Wu* fails to cure the deficiencies in *Hochmuth*. Applicants respectfully submit that the patentability of independent Claims 44 and 52 as previously discussed renders moot the obviousness rejection of Claims 49 and 57 that depend therefrom. In this regard, the cited art fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of Claims 49 and 57 in combination with the novel elements of Claims 44 and 52.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection with respect to Claims 49 and 57 be reconsidered and the rejection be withdrawn.


Upon further examination, the Office Action dated May 1, 2008 appeared to be final, as indicated in the Office Action Conclusion, as opposed to non-final, as indicated in the Office Action Summary. The examiner was contacted June 30, 2008 and indicated that the Office Action was non-final.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified patent application and earnestly solicit an early allowance of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas C. Basso  
Reg. No. 46,541  
Customer No. 29175

Dated: July 11, 2008